

# CAPTAIN DREYFUS, IN ANSWER TO THE JOURNAL'S QUESTION, SAYS HE CANNOT CONCEIVE THE PURPOSE OF HIS PERSECUTION.

When the Police Catch Labori's Assailant He Will Be Forced to Tell Who Hired Him to Kill the Lawyer, and the Name He Discloses Will Make the Mystery of Perjury, Forgery, Suicide and Murder Clear. Colonel Picquart Points Out the Real Traitors.

AS MUCH A MYSTERY TO THE VICTIM OF THE TANGLED PLOTS AS TO ANYBODY ELSE.

## THE JOURNAL'S QUESTION:

*"Can you reveal the mainspring of this long series of forgeries, perjuries, suicides and suspected murders that have collected around you?"*

## CAPTAIN DREYFUS'S ANSWER:

*"Although all I have on earth, more than life itself, is pending, I assure you I can only see the injustice and the malice. I cannot understand it at all."*

By Harry J.W. Dam  
(Copyright, 1899, by the New York Journal and Advertiser.)

RENNES, France, Aug. 18.—The assassin of Labori is surrounded and should be caught and brought in within forty-eight hours. His trail was picked up yesterday at a farm on the byroad between the Fougères road and Servon, on the way to Paris. Here he was seen plodding along the road at 4:30 o'clock yesterday morning. He stopped at a barber shop at Servon and asked for a razor to shave himself, which was furnished him. The barber's wife, who gave a complete description of him, said he looked tired and worn out.

Satisfactory traces were also found of him at Chateau Giron, some miles further on, and it is now evident that he is following the road to Paris, which is never any great distance from the railway, where he evidently hopes to steal a ride or take a ticket on a passing train. If he does this he will be instantly caught.

If he continues his march in the same direction he must come in another day to the open country, the entrance to which is completely picketed, military gendarmes being on watch for him in all the surrounding communes.

### The Assassin Holds the Key.

Words cannot describe the tremendous interest with which this man's capture is awaited. There is no doubt whatever, no difference in the opinion that he was paid for his crime.

All the ingenuity of the French inquisitorial system will be used to find out who paid him. It is hoped that through him the hidden hand in this case—the hand which has pulled all the wires of which not only Esterhazy, Henry and Du Paty de Clam, but also Mercier and Boisdreffe, seem to be the puppets—will be at last revealed.

Through the assassin of Labori we may find out why no inquest was held on Henry; whether Henry killed himself or was murdered, and how the spy, Lemerrier Picard, was able to hang himself with a shoestring while his feet were touching the floor.

### Even Dreyfus Cannot Tell.

These things are dense mysteries now. Even Dreyfus does not know whose is the hand that has smitten him so direly.

With the hope that the impenetrable cloud which hangs over this case might be clear to at least the man who has the most at stake, I yesterday asked a friend to obtain from Dreyfus not his comments—they (his comments) being rigidly refused—but merely an answer, yes or no, as to whether he understood and could later reveal the main spring of this long series of forgeries, perjuries, suicides, suspected murders and attempted assassination which, without the slightest knowledge or effort on his part, have collected around himself. But it seems that even he, like everybody else, is in total darkness.

His friend said: "He is completely at sea."

Dreyfus says: "Although all I have on earth, more than life itself, is pending, I assure you I can only see the injustice and the malice. I cannot understand it at all."

Continuing on his own account, the friend said: "You know Dreyfus was a Jew and the Jews are greatly disliked by the General Staff. You heard Picquart say yesterday that, admiring Dreyfus for his ability and promise as a soldier, he put him in the Department of Manoeuvres, where there was the least anti-Semitic feeling. Dreyfus was also extremely zealous, ambitious and able, and this excited the natural jealousy which was augmented greatly in his particular case, but neither he nor I nor any of us can find in this dislike, jealousy or hatred sufficient explanation for what has been done."

### It Was Not Personal Hatred.

Esterhazy had no personal malice against Dreyfus. When he forged the bordereau he did not know him. If Henry and Esterhazy were traitors they could not be mad enough to attract inevitable attention to their treachery by unnecessarily accusing another man. If they desired to find some explanation of the use of secret service money, which may have been appropriated, they could easily forge receipts from parties who could not be found.

"No, Esterhazy, Henry and Du Paty de Clam have all declared in accusing Dreyfus they were acting under the orders of their superiors. Their ultimate superior was Mercier, but why should Mercier hate Dreyfus, of whom he knew nothing? Why should Mercier so far descend from his position as a soldier, a gentleman and a Minister to dirty his hands and stain his name as he has done?"

"The truth has not come out yet, but it will."

The foregoing will explain the disappointment felt to-day when Picquart finished his evidence and the hoped-for revelation did not come. He went over all the points of the case from his standpoint,



ENTRANCE TO THE LYCEE, WHERE THE DREYFUS COURT MARTIAL IS TAKING PLACE.

From Le Petit Parisien.

This picture shows the guards at the door of the building wherein Dreyfus is battling to prove his innocence of treachery.

but said nothing he had not said before.

At the close Roget and Mercier demanded to be heard. Picquart was confronted with them. The two Generals in all the bravery of their brilliant uniforms facing the Colonel, who wears a uniform no longer, but who now looks more like a calm, determined, shrewd barrister than a dashing French officer.

Various small points were discussed, and then we had an interesting little scene. Demange demanded of Mercier why, when he sent the secret dossier before the court-martial without the knowledge of the accused, he included in it a document which it was strongly suspected referred not to Dreyfus, but another name beginning with "D."

Mercier hesitated. He was not happy or composed in his answer when he said he thought the court-martial would be best judge of that. The judges all noted this, and it made a distinct point in favor of Dreyfus.

## DOSSIER IS TORN ALL TO ATOMS.

RENNES, Aug. 18.—Colonel Picquart, former chief of the Intelligence Office of the War Office, was on the witness stand all to-day. He testified fearlessly in the presence of Generals Roget, Zurlinden and Billot, former Ministers of War.

Maitre Moreau, who argued the case of Dreyfus before the Court of Cassation, was present with Maitre Demange.

Picquart then discussed the secret dossier, a close analysis of which, he asserted, was particularly necessary, owing to the weight the document had with the members of the court-martial in 1894.

"This dossier," continued the witness, "may be divided into two parts—the first contains three documents:

"One—a document known as the D'Arville document, the terms of which are about as follows: 'Doubt the proofs; service letters, situation dangerous for me with French officer; no information from an officer of the line; important only as coming from the Ministry; already somewhere else.'"

"Two—The document containing the words, 'Cette Canaille de D'—'

"Three—a document which is nothing but a supplementary review of the first. It contained the gist of seven or eight documents, one of which, 'Cette Canaille de D'—' will serve for the purpose of comparison. It also contained the correspondence of attacks 'A' and 'B.'"

These initials represent Colonel Schwartzkoppen, formerly German Military Attaché at Paris, and Major Panizzardi, the former Military Attaché of Italy at the French capital.

Colonel Picquart took up the "Cette Canaille de D'—" document. He called the attention of the Court to the fact that it was addressed by Schwartzkoppen to Panizzardi, and not vice versa, as long believed.

After giving his reasons for believing Dreyfus was not the person referred to in this document, Picquart showed how Du Paty de Clam had endeavored to ascribe the authorship of the document to Panizzardi, with a view to establishing a connection which, in reality, did not exist between the various documents in the indictment against Dreyfus.

"May I be allowed to express my deep regret at the absence of Major Du Paty de Clam?" remarked Colonel Picquart.

"It seems to me indispensable that this officer, who wrote the commentaries on the secret dossier, should be summoned to give evidence here. He would give us his reminiscences, and I would help him."

"But, since I am dealing with this question of the commentaries of Major Du Paty de Clam, permit me to point out to you, gentlemen, that this document was not the property of any particular Minister. It was classified as belonging to the Intelligence Department, and, as you see, it formed part of a well-defined dossier—a dossier which was shut up in one of the drawers of my desk, and which was also started from it. This commentaries, therefore, upon a secret dossier document which was improperly removed from my department." (Sensation.)

## EXILED TO TUNIS TO SILENCE HIM.

RENNES, Aug. 18.—Speaking of the mission to Tunis, upon which he was dispatched, Colonel Picquart described the irritation he felt when he saw he was being removed because he was no longer wanted as head of the Intelligence Department. He explained that if this disgrace had been frankly avowed it would have been much less painful to him. The Colonel also said that during his absence his correspondence was tampered with.

While he was in Tunis, a mission which, he said, ought to have been entrusted to a comrade of his, Henry, abandoning his underhand intrigues, began a campaign of open persecution. Henry wrote to the witness, accusing him of communicating information to the press, with disclosing the contents of secret documents, and with attempting to suborn officers in connection with the petit bleu.

It was then Picquart learned of the secret existence of the forged secret documents directed against himself, and foresaw his own ruin if the Dreyfus affair was reopened, and, to safeguard himself, he intrusted to a lawyer friend, a certain letter from General Goussier, at the same time acquainting him with what he knew of Esterhazy, and instructing the lawyer how he should intervene, "if the occasion demanded it."

This lawyer, M. Lohols, communicated with M. Schreier-Koehler, then one of the vice-presidents of the Senate, and the representations of the latter to Premier Maitre Demange followed.

When Picquart's furlough was due, General Leclerc, commanding in Tunis, was ordered to send him to the frontier of Tripoli. Leclerc committed to the witness on this abnormal order, and Picquart could not to him the probable reasons for it and his belief in the innocence of Dreyfus.

General Leclerc, however, ordered Picquart not to go beyond Gabès.

## LABORI'S ASSAILANT OR ELSE A MADMAN.

RENNES, Aug. 18.—A man named Glorot has been arrested at Dol, in the Department of Ille-et-Vilaine, fifteen miles south-east of St. Malo, on suspicion of being the assailant of Maitre Labori.

Glorot was arrested because he said in a cabaret yesterday:

"I am the man who shot Labori."

The police believe the prisoner is only a lunatic or a drunkard desirous of attracting attention, and his so-called confession may turn out to be nothing more than an empty boast.

Glorot was brought to Rennes this evening. Colonel Picquart, M. Gast and others who saw him declare he was not the man. The prisoner has written a letter to the police making a confession and glorifying the crime.

The doctors say he is mad.

Maitre Labori is not so well this afternoon. He averted himself yesterday and today he was only allowed to exercise for half an hour, which he spent in the garden. His wound is no worse, but he is suffering from nervousness.

## ESTERHAZY, AUTHOR OF THE BORDEREAU.

Picquart Tells How He Fastened the Guilt on Him.

RENNES, Aug. 18.—Colonel Picquart explained how he had acquired the conviction that the bordereau was written by Esterhazy, and how he ascertained that the anti-Dreyfus proofs were worthless.

The first occasion on which he had seen Esterhazy's name, he said earnestly, was when he read the address of the petit bleu. Before that he did not know him and had never had him watched.

What he gathered about Esterhazy's character, he continued, created the worst impression upon him, but he learned nothing to connect Esterhazy with any act of espionage. Therefore, he did not mention his suspicions. An agent, however, was ordered to watch Esterhazy, who had completely compromised himself through his relations with an English company, of which he had agreed to become a director.

"That could not be permitted in the case of a French officer," said Picquart. "Moreover, Esterhazy gambled, led a life of debauchery and lived with Mademoiselle Pays."

"In answer to my request," said the witness, "General De Boisdreffe wrote me, asking me to meet him at the train on his arrival from Vichy. While driving from the railroad station to the General's hotel I told him all I had done in regard to Esterhazy."

"I affirm that General De Boisdreffe knew that this question was to remain a secret between us and that I was not to write it except to the Minister of War."

"I knew Esterhazy was anxious to enter the War Office, and I did not regard his which were in my possession as photographed, and showed the photographs to Major Du Paty de Clam and M. Bertillon (the handwriting expert), between August 25 and September 5."

Colonel Picquart said Du Paty de Clam declared the writing was that of Mathieu Dreyfus, the brother of Captain Dreyfus.

"I frankly admit I was stupefied on reading the secret dossier. I expected to find, in the handwriting of Esterhazy, nothing but a document which might apply just as much to Esterhazy as to Dreyfus, an unimportant document mentioning D'Arville, and a document which it seemed absurd to apply to Dreyfus, namely, the 'Cette Canaille de D'—' document, which appeared to be at least as worthless as the secret dossier."

"Before starting to see General Goussier I copied a note, four pages in length, which I made on September 1, containing my résumé of the Esterhazy affair. When I informed General Goussier of all which had occurred he remarked:

"So a mistake has been made."

"The commentary was prepared for me."

RENNES, Aug. 18.—Maitre Demange compelled General Mercier to enumerate the secret documents submitted to the first court-martial. Among them was the "Cette Canaille de D'—"

When asked why the commentary of Goussier was not attached to the document, Mercier replied: "It was supplied for my personal use."

"Then," said Maitre Demange triumphantly, "you must have known the D'— could not have meant Dreyfus, but did mean Duhalès."

The court adjourned at 11:40 a. m. until to-morrow.

Another Forgery Called.

Paris, Aug. 18.—The Figaro publishes a letter from Count Paul Esterhazy, the Austrian Charge d'Affaires at Paris, confirming Schneider's denial of a letter mentioned by Generals Roget and Mercier, alleged to have been written by the Austrian military attaché at Berlin, declaring Dreyfus had relations with Germany.

Proprietors, observe and assimilate your food with Nature's Digestive Tablets.



Dreyfus's Dramatic Declaration of Innocence.

(From the London Morning Leader.)  
"It is false!" cried the prisoner, rising to his feet; "It is false, my Colonel!" This was early in the trial. The picture was sketched in court by an artist of the Morning Leader.

## GENERALS ANGRY AT COLONEL PICQUART.

Roget and Mercier Deny Some of His Assertions.

RENNES, Aug. 18.—Generals Roget and Mercier, having intimated a desire to speak, Colonel Jonaus asked Dreyfus if he had anything to say, and the prisoner replied in the negative.

General Roget mounted the platform and said: "Colonel Picquart attacked me this morning in regard to my speech for the prosecution yesterday on the subject of the Quenell affair. He said he was not present at the Ministry of War when the case was in progress, and he ascribed it to Colonel Henry. That is quite incorrect. I ask Colonel Picquart if he denies that he wrote Captain Marchal an order to connect him with Galanti, that he wrote to the public prosecutor enclosing documents, and that he wrote to the public prosecutor a second time, July 15. If he denies this, I ask the court to send for Marchal and the dossier in the Quenell affair."

Colonel Picquart replied that there was no need to threaten to produce the dossier in order to make him reply. "I did not say I was absent during the Quenell affair," he added. "I said I was absent part of the time, and that painful duties did not permit me to participate in it as I should otherwise have done."

"Did you write those letters?" asked Colonel Jonaus.

"Yes," replied Picquart. "I remember writing letters in the case, though I do not remember exactly their terms or dates."

General Mercier promptly replaced General Roget.

"Colonel Picquart," Mercier said, "has stated that I ordered him to convey documents to Colonel Maurel. That is false. I never handed any packet to Colonel Picquart for Colonel Maurel. I never mentioned upon the disappearance of Du Paty de Clam's commentary, to which General Mercier answered:

"The commentary was prepared for me."

RENNES, Aug. 18.—Maitre Demange compelled General Mercier to enumerate the secret documents submitted to the first court-martial. Among them was the "Cette Canaille de D'—"

When asked why the commentary of Goussier was not attached to the document, Mercier replied: "It was supplied for my personal use."

"Then," said Maitre Demange triumphantly, "you must have known the D'— could not have meant Dreyfus, but did mean Duhalès."

The court adjourned at 11:40 a. m. until to-morrow.

Another Forgery Called.

Paris, Aug. 18.—The Figaro publishes a letter from Count Paul Esterhazy, the Austrian Charge d'Affaires at Paris, confirming Schneider's denial of a letter mentioned by Generals Roget and Mercier, alleged to have been written by the Austrian military attaché at Berlin, declaring Dreyfus had relations with Germany.

Proprietors, observe and assimilate your food with Nature's Digestive Tablets.

## GONSE TRIED TO SILENCE PICQUART.

But the Colonel's Sense of Justice Made Him Speak.

RENNES, Aug. 18.—After Colonel Picquart had spoken for two hours and a half he was visibly distressed. He had occasional attacks of coughing, but managed to continue, Colonel Jonaus not showing any inclination to suspend the session of the court in order to give him needed rest.

Describing his interview with General Goussier, on September 15, Picquart said:

"When I asked General Goussier for permission to continue the investigation, leading on the danger of allowing the Dreyfus family to proceed with their investigation alone, the General replied that it was impossible in his opinion, and in the opinion of General de Boisdreffe and the Minister of War, to reopen the affair. When I pressed the point, in order to make General Goussier understand that nothing could prevent its reopening if it could be believed Dreyfus was innocent, General Goussier replied:

"If you say nothing, nobody will know."

"General," replied, firmly, "What you tell me is absolutely false. I do not know what I shall do. But I won't carry this secret with me." (Great sensation.)

He, at Least, Was Honest.

"I at once left the room," added the witness. "That is what occurred. I know my account is disputed, but I positively swear it," said Picquart, as he snote the bar in front of the witness-box, and looked in the direction of the generals.

The colonel described his intentions with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.

In order to make the proofs complete, he continued his investigations with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.

In order to make the proofs complete, he continued his investigations with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.

In order to make the proofs complete, he continued his investigations with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.

In order to make the proofs complete, he continued his investigations with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.

In order to make the proofs complete, he continued his investigations with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.

In order to make the proofs complete, he continued his investigations with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.

In order to make the proofs complete, he continued his investigations with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.

In order to make the proofs complete, he continued his investigations with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.

In order to make the proofs complete, he continued his investigations with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.

In order to make the proofs complete, he continued his investigations with the bar to Esterhazy, which General Goussier and de Boisdreffe had forbidden him to carry out. He attached particular importance to this point, as it contained a clue to subsequent occurrences.